A.   Claims

Claims 12–19 were pending in the application. Claims 12-19 have been amended. Applicant respectfully notes claims 12-13 and 15-17 have been spaced for improved readability. Claims 20-21 have been added. Claims 12-21 are pending.

B.   Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner consider reference B on the information disclosure statement stamped received in the OIPE on July 1, 2002. It appears the Examiner considered reference A, however, reference B has not been initialed by the Examiner.

C.   Election/Restriction

Applicant respectfully notes the Examiner's reasons for making the restriction requirement final. Applicant, however, for at least reasons expressed in the first response to the restriction requirement, continues to preserve the right to petition the Commissioner.

D.   Oath/Declaration

The Examiner objected to the oath/declaration because it "does not include the inventor's signature." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes a signed declaration was received by the Patent and Trademark Office on January 8, 2002. A copy of the declaration has been attached for the Examiner's convenience.

E.   35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by RFC 2131-DHCP (hereinafter "DHCP"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that the standard for "anticipation" is one of fairly strict identity. To anticipate a claim of a patent, a single prior source must contain all the claimed essential elements. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231

U.S.P.Q.81, 91 (Fed.Cir. 1986); *In re Donahue*, 766 F.2d 531, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

DHCP does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "each node... receiving unique identifiers for the other nodes (emphasis added)" as recited in claim 12. The Examiner points to a section of DHCP for this teaching that discloses a node sending a client identifier to a DHCP server. DHCP does not suggest each node of a plurality of nodes receiving the unique identifier. Instead, the Examiner is pointing to a portion of the DHCP that discusses an interaction between one node and one server in the network.

Furthermore, DHCP does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "each node... in an address table comprising a plurality of records, each record corresponding to one of the nodes in the plurality of nodes and including a unique identifier for the node and a network address for the node: if a record containing the unique identifier does not exist, creating a new record and inserting the received unique identifier into the record; and if a record containing the unique identifier does exist, updating the record" as recited in claim 12. Again, the Examiner is focusing on the actions of one server in the network described by DHCP. DHCP does not disclose that "each node" in the plurality of nodes on a network maintain an address table using the recited method.

Applicant also further asserts at least these claim features are not obvious in view of the cited art. Applicant respectfully asserts claim 12 and claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least the above reasons.

F.   New Claims

The cited art does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "wherein each node in the plurality of nodes independently determines a network address for at least each other node in the plurality of nodes using the periodically broadcast unique identifiers from each of the other nodes in the plurality of nodes and using the common predetermined manner" as recited in claim 20 or "wherein the plurality of nodes does not include a server" as recited in claim 21.

G.   Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claim 19 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant

notes claim 19 has been converted into an independent claim which includes all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

H.   Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel Deposit Account No. 501505\5957-33500.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell Henrichs
Reg. No. 50,354
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
        Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: July 5, 2005